

MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, January 19TH, 2006

Present: Jean Bonander
Alan Zahradnik
Andy Preston
Hamid Shamsapour
Amy Van Doren
Luke McCann
Karen Nygren
Mervin Giacomini
Bob Brown
Dana Whitson

Absent: Farhad Mansourian
Rocky Birdsey

Staff Members Present: Craig Tackabery, Marin DPW Assistant Director
Hank Haugse, Nolte Associates
David Parisi, Parisi Associates

Chair Bonander called the Technical Advisory Committee Meeting to order at 3:36 p.m.

1. Introductions

Committee members and staff did self-introductions.

2. Staff Comments

None.

3. Committee Member Comments

None.

4. Open Time for Public Expression

None.

5. Consent Calendar

Meeting Minutes

M/S McCann/Shamsapour to approve the November 17, 2005 meeting minutes with minor edits suggested by Chair Bonander. The motion was approved unanimously.

6. Measure A Strategy 3, Major Roads and Related Infrastructure

Craig Tackabery informed the TAC that the MPWA was continuing to collect data to complete the Major Roadway Data Table. This information as expected to be available for the next TAC meeting. Craig reviewed the prioritization methodology and the schedule, and reported that it was staff's intent to analyze the Data Table with the different performance criteria weights recommended by the TAC, and due to the Data Table not being complete, no action was recommended at today's meeting.

Jean Bonander suggested that a special meeting of the TAC could be held to complete the project prioritization process.

Andy Preston suggested that the TAC decide on the weighting of performance criteria at today's meeting.

Karen Nygren stated that the overriding goal of the Expenditure Plan was to improve mobility and that the TAC should consider this when we weigh all the other criterion.

Bob Brown suggested that the TAC use two approaches, one weighted and the other not weighted. Andy Preston urged the TAC to take advantage of the MPWA's expertise and the MPWA's criterion weighting recommendation. Additional discussion followed on the weighting of the performance criterion.

Jean Bonander suggested that the TAC resolve the performance criteria weighting issue in a timely manner.

David Parisi suggested that the TAC use an established resolution process to reach consensus. Each TAC member would allocate 100 points to the six criteria based on their opinion of the criteria's weighting. The scores would be tallied and then averaged. The TAC could then review the results and use the findings to reach agreement. The results are summarized below. Based on the discussion, the TAC agreed to the following weighting:

Pavement Condition Index	38
Average Daily Traffic	20
Transit Activity	12
Bike and Ped Activity	13
School Access	10
Accident Rate	7
	100

It should be noted that ten TAC members participated in assigning weights and that most of the weightings provided by each TAC member for each criterion did not vary greatly from the average weights shown above. In fact, when discounting the highest

and lowest individual weightings assigned to each criterion, the results are very similar to the overall averages shown above.

The TAC further discussed an evaluation process that did not consider weighting. Jean Bonander asked if the MPWA evaluation or the TAC evaluation would have priority. Craig Tackabery stated that the findings of both groups would be considered by the TAM Board in the process.

Mervin Giacomini asked about local input to the Region Road prioritization process. Craig Tackabery pointed out that the project prioritization methodology included input from citizens as part of the project sponsors' project development process.

7. Measure A Strategy 4 – Crossing Guard Program Process

TAM staff reviewed the Crossing Guard Program Development Process and the schedule (agenda item 7a) with the TAC. The crossing guard program implementation is planned for the 2006 / 2007 school year.

Staff reviewed the *Criteria for Adult Crossing Guards (Caltrans criteria)*, as contained in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. This criterion is generally used by communities to determine if a crossing guard would be warranted and cost effective at a location. Staff also provided information on policies that have been used to guide other programs (agenda item 7b). Generally, communities use the Caltrans criteria. However, some communities have also considered other factors as outlined in the staff report.

Karen Nygren stated that the age of the school children is an important consideration.

Staff reported on the funding and implementation policies as presented to the TAM Executive Committee (agenda item 7c). Based on the draft TAM budget and an estimate of crossing guard costs, a preliminary estimate of 60 locations can be funded by the TAM program. The Executive Committee suggested that approximately 40 locations be considered at this time. This would allow additional locations identified in the second phase of evaluation in May.

Luke McCann stated that background checks would be required for the personnel hired by the crossing guard contractor.

Karen Nygren stated that it would be desirable for the new contractor to hire crossing guards currently employed by the schools or schools districts, if the locations they served were funded by the TAM program.

Staff informed the TAC that the MPWA members supported the use of Caltrans criteria, modified to allow locations that met the criteria during just one hour instead of two one-hour periods. This resulted in 39 locations.

M/S Brown/Whitson to concur with the MPWA recommendation, and to recommend to the TAM Board the locations that satisfy the Caltrans criteria for both morning and afternoon time periods and for either the morning or afternoon time periods.

Luke McCann stated that the crossing guard questionnaire for the second phase of evaluation would be sent to the schools again in February 2006. The distribution would follow the TAM crossing guard presentation to the School Superintendents at their next meeting on Feb 1st.

Open Discussion

8. Adjourn to February 16, 2006 meeting

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 pm